

Spix sensu Boulenger (1885, p. 337). Although the type specimen(s) appears to be lost (Guibé, 1954), it is clear that Daudin's concept of *T. monitor* was a broad one. He cites several Seba and Merian plates that between them depict examples of both *T. teguixin* (sensu Boulenger) and *T. nigropunctatus*. Thus, until a lecto-type or neotype is designated, *T. monitor* should be regarded as a composite. This does not prevent this nominal species adequately serving as the type of the genus. The two component species are closely related and no worker has ever suggested, or is likely to suggest, that they do not belong to the same genus-group taxon.

REFERENCES

- BURT, C. E. & BURT, M. D. 1933. A preliminary checklist of the lizards of South America. *Trans. Acad. Sci. St Louis*, vol. 28, pp. 1-104.
 GUIBE, J. 1954. *Catalogue des types de lézards du Muséum national d'Histoire Naturelle*. 119 pp. (Paris).
 PRESCH, W. 1973. A review of the tegus, lizard genus *Tupinambis* (Sauria: Teiidae) from South America. *Copeia*, 1973, pp. 740-746.
 RAY, J. 1693. *Synopsis methodica animalium quadrupedum et serpentini generis*, 336 pp. (London).

COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED CONSERVATION OF
DENDROBATES WAGLER, 1830 AND *DENDROBATIDAE* COPE, 1865.
 Z.N.(S.)1930
 (see vol. 39, pp. 264-278)

- (1) By L. B. Holthuis (*Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Postbus 9517, 2300 RA Leiden, Netherlands*)

I do not agree with M. Dubois that *Dendrobates* is a replacement name for *Hylaplesia* merely because *Hylaplesia* was cited in the synonymy of *Dendrobates* when the latter was established. Wagler nowhere stated that he intended to replace the name *Hylaplesia*, neither did he say that *Dendrobates* covered all of *Hylaplesia*. Actually he said that he knew of two species of *Hylaplesia*. An example of an often-used kind of synonymy in a newly established name is (a fictitious case): '*Macrobrachium* nov. gen. (= *Palaemon* Fabricius, 1798; *Astacus* Fabricius, 1775; *Cancer* Linnaeus, 1758)'. The author of the new name only wants to indicate that the species that he brings into the new genus were placed by Linnaeus, 1758, in *Cancer*, by Fabricius, 1775, in *Astacus*, and later removed to his genus *Palaemon* (1798). This cannot be taken to mean that *Macrobrachium* is intended as a replacement name for the other three.

Another example: take a genus *A-us* Jones, 1850, type species *A-us albus* Jones, 1850, by monotypy, to which *A-us niger* Smith, 1875 and *A-us ruber* Baker, 1900 are later referred. If I discover that *A-us* Jones, 1850 is preoccupied by *A-us* Carpenter, 1800, I may erect a new genus *B-us* with the same three species but designate *ruber* Baker as the type species with *A-us* Jones non Carpenter in synonymy. *B-us* is then not a new replacement name (*nomen novum*) for *A-us* Jones because its genus has a different type species.

Hence the type species of *Dendrobates* is *Rana tinctoria* Cuvier by subsequent designation by Duméril & Bibron and there is no need to use the plenary powers to attain this end.

As to the authorship of the names proposed in Schlegel, 1826 and 1827, this is in both cases Schlegel, not Boie in Schlegel. The text of both papers (of which the second is a German translation of the first) is by Schlegel except that some of Boie's names are cited with indications sufficient to make them available. None of the descriptions in Boie's much longer MS (which is at Leiden) is quoted. *Hylaplesia* Schlegel, 1827 is not an emendation of *Hysaplesia* Schlegel, 1826 but an incorrect subsequent spelling. It may well be that *Hysaplesia* is a lapsus for *Hylaplesia*, but as this is not obvious from the original publication alone, it cannot be taken into account here. As *Dendrobates* is not a replacement name for *Hysaplesia*, whatever type species is fixed for *Dendrobates* is not automatically the type species of *Hysaplesia*. Hence Stejneger's 1937 selection of *Hyla punctata* Daudin as type species of *Hysaplesia* must stand. *Hysaplesia* thereby becomes a junior subjective synonym of *Hyla* Laurenti, 1768 and there is no need to suppress this name. Nor is there any need to suppress the unavailable name *Hylaplesia* Schlegel, 1827.

Personally, I am not impressed by the arguments for giving DENDROBATIDAE precedence over PHYLLOBATIDAE. I should like to see proposal (1) dropped, (4) taken without the endorsement, and all mention of the plenary powers removed from (5) and (6). *Hysaplesia* should not be placed on the Official Index.

(2) By Alain Dubois (*Laboratoire des Reptiles et Amphibiens, Muséum national d'Histoire naturelle, 25 rue Cuvier, 75005 Paris, France*)

I disagree with HOLTHUIS (1983) on the status of the generic name *Dendrobates*, which I persist to consider as a strict replacement name for *Hylaplesia*. This opinion is based on a careful examination of WAGLER's texts, rather than on general statements or principles, or on fictitious or idealised examples. We have given elsewhere arguments to show that application of the Code to old, 'pre-Code' texts, 'must be made with care, understanding and intelligence' (BOUR & DUBOIS, 1983). In the present case, and although WAGLER (1830) did not use the words 'replacement name' (a phrase which did not exist in his times), a careful examination of his 1830 text clearly shows that, as explained before (DUBOIS, 1982b), names like *Asterodactylus*, *Dendrobates*, *Enydrobius* or *Systoma* were introduced by him strictly as replacement names for names considered by him, for some reason, as inappropriate. Instead of discussing this in detail in this *Bulletin*, I think it simpler and more convincing to refer the readers to WAGLER's (1830) original text itself. Other arguments could also be found by studying the other publications of WAGLER. For example, WAGLER (1827) presented his new name *Asterodactylus* as follows: '(*Asterodactylus m. Pipa* Auctor.)', which confirms the interpretation of *Asterodactylus* as a replacement name for *Pipa* already presented (DUBOIS, 1982b).

2. SCHLEGEL's paper (1826, reprinted 1827) is not based on personal observations of SCHLEGEL, but on the study of manuscripts by BOIE (and also by KUHL & VAN HASSELT). SCHLEGEL had not seen the species he refers